

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,950	11/18/2003	Miyuki Fukasawa	080542-0163	, 9191
22428 7590 01/07/2008 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007		EXAMINER		
			TRAN, SUSAN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1615	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/714,950	FUKASAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan T. Tran	1615	

	Susan T. Tran	1615					
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
HE REPLY FILED 18 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
B. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.	21. See attached Nation of Non Co	maliant Amandmant	(DTOL 224)				
-		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112, first paragraph rejection. 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling							
non-allowable claim(s). '. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>9-12</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a				
10. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•		•				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see continuation sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
io. Ouler. .		REMANANCE OF THE PARTY OF THE P	HAM MINER				
		Art Unit: 1615					

10/714,950 Art Unit: 1615

Continuation

The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 12/18/07 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 9-12 based upon the 103(a) rejections as set forth in the last Office action because: it refers only to the system described in the above referenced application and not to the individual claims of the application. The present claims recite the transitional phrase "comprising of", and therefore, do not preclude the present of the gastric-resistant polymer. Thus, there is no showing that the objective evidence of nonobviousness is commensurate in scope with the claims. See MPEP § 716.

Applicant argues that Zgoulli added an oil into a mixture of a gastro-resistant polymer and gum arabic, which has a different order of addition from the present invention leading to a product with different physical characteristics.

However, it is noted that the order of adding the ingredients taught by Zgoulli is similar to the present invention. The different being argued by applicant is the addition/present of the gastro-resistant polymer in the gum arabic. However, the transitional phrase "comprising of" permits the present of the gastric-resistant polymer taught by Zgoulli.

MAINY EXAMINE

AU1615